

## March 3, 2015, PB&R Agenda Comments

Comments on Newport Beach Parks, Beaches and Recreation Commission agenda submitted by:

Jim Mosher ( [jimmosher@yahoo.com](mailto:jimmosher@yahoo.com) ), 2210 Private Road, Newport Beach 92660 (949-548-6229)

### **Item (5)A. Minutes of the February 3, 2015 meeting**

The following corrections are suggested:

Page 2, last paragraph: “Discussion followed regarding the lighting, the outfield, the proposed soccer field, and the possibility of another adult size soccer ~~outlay~~ overlay within the field; ...” [?]

Page 3, first paragraph: “Ensuing discussion ~~regarding~~ regarded the possibility another soccer ~~outlay~~ overlay could mean ...”

Page 3, paragraph 2, line 6: “Bonita Creek has been their “home fields” since 2001.”

Page 3, under public discussion (see Newport-Mesa Girls Softball [website](#)):

“John ~~Ross~~ Graass, President of the Newport/Mesa Girls Softball League, commented ...”

“Jason ~~Follett~~ Pouliot, Newport/Mesa Girls Softball League, spoke ...”

Page 4: “Lee ~~Defranisco~~ DiFrancesco, Newport/Mesa Girls Softball League, spoke ...”

Page 4, paragraph 4 from end, last sentence: “He addressed the timeline noting that if the project is not approved as presented ~~that~~ it would be delayed.”

Page 5, last paragraph: “Acting ~~GOCo~~ Director Pisani commented on ...”

Page 6, paragraph 2: “Commissioner Howald noted that the Ad Hoc Dog Park Committee had inspected four sites ...” [note: the comma later in this sentence is unnecessary]

Page 6, last paragraph: “Jim Mosher expressed confusion regarding the issue of dog parks, and thanked Commissioner Howald for clarifying.”

### **Item (5)B. Parks & Operations Division Activity Report**

Last page: The 1,139 trees reported planted in January is a rather extraordinary increase over the typical monthly activity. Is this a misprint? If not, where were the new trees planted? There does not seem to be any explanation in the report.

***Item (6)A. Special Tree Removal - Groves Bike Trail***

This doesn't seem a particularly large or significant tree, but I remain unconvinced a clear correlation has been established between sulfur conks and root failure. My impression is the last Groves Trail tree to fail due to lack of roots *did not* exhibit conks, while the roots from at least one that *did* exhibit conks could not be dislodged with a tractor.

***Item (6)B. Special Tree Removal - 1924 Tradewinds Lane (Leeward Lane Side)***

The several tree replacement items on the present agenda beg the question of what happened to the Council's tree policies, G-1 and G-6? PB&R forwarded a recommendation to the City Council on December 2, 2014, yet three months later it does not yet appear even on a [tentative list](#) of items to be considered at future Council meetings (as distributed at the Council's February 24, 2015, meeting). Will they be wrapped into the general updates to Council Policies expected in April or May, meaning (if lumped with changes to many other unrelated policies) they will receive essentially no further public scrutiny?

***Item (6)D. Potential Dog Parks Ad Hoc Committee Update***

My quick thoughts on the suggested locations are:

1. **West Newport** (lower Sunset View Park): this location seems good because it would serve a different population than the Civic Center park, however:
  - a. Land has a fairly steep slope, not normal in a dog park.
  - b. Will adequate parking be available here in the summer? This would seem to add demand to a lot already intended to serve both beach goers and visitors to Sunset Ridge Park as well as the existing Sunset View Park. The Police also close this lot as a "staging area" on some holidays.
  - c. Might this proposal interfere with plans for a pedestrian bridge spanning Superior, possibly at this location? If it has not already been developed as part of Sunset View Park, I would suspect it is being reserved for that possibility.
  - d. Would seem to require a Coastal Development Permit, and would not seem to be a uniquely coastal-dependent or coastal-related use.
  - e. Depending on design, fencing might impede existing public views.
2. **Lower Castaways**: I have noticed the rocky beach just below the bluff is already somewhat popular with owners allowing their dogs to swim in the channel, but the present suggestion would seem to conflict with the previously announced vision of having a large landscaped area that would serve as a site for the whole public, not just dog owners, to enjoy the coastal/harbor setting (perhaps for concerts and programs as well as general recreation). The dog park plan would seem to essentially obliterate the

entire planned public area. Fencing off an area within some larger park, or finding a less sensitive location, would seem more appropriate to me.

3. **Bonita Canyon Sports Park / AT&T Property** : of the recommendations offered, this seems the best to me, however it would serve essentially the same population as the Civic Center park, and I would have to question the need for a second dog park on the same street (MacArthur) and so close to the existing one. If two dog parks are being developed so close together, I would think dog owners in other parts of the City would be expecting dog areas in parks near their homes as well.

### ***Item (6)E. Proposed Modifications to the Civic Center Dog Park***

1. It is unclear from the staff report if PB&R is being asked to make a recommendation to Council, or has final approval authority over this modification.
2. Either way, the cost of the proposed improvements, and how to minimize the costs, would seem important components of the decision.
3. The final paragraph of the report says "*All dog park signs will be updated to reflect new policies and procedures for use of the small dog park.*" What are the new policies? How were they determined? Does PB&R need to approve them or make a recommendation to Council?

### ***Item (6)F. 2016 Recreation & Senior Services Department Budget Overview***

If staff is seeking thoughtful input from the Commission and public on how resources should be allocated in the coming year, it would have seemed helpful to post the proposed allocations in advance of the meeting so those offering comments would have had a chance to study them.